

Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project

Summary Report

THE GETTY CONSERVATION INSTITUTE

PREPARED BY KATHRYN WELCH HOWE — KWH

NOVEMBER 2001



The Getty Conservation Institute

© 2001 The J. Paul Getty Trust

CONTENTS

3	Preface
4	Introduction
5	Findings and Conclusions
8	A Brief History of Historic Preservation in Los Angeles
9	Methodology Employed by the Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project
10	History and Assessment of the Surveys Conducted in Los Angeles to Date
11	Current Survey Practices in Los Angeles
12	The Potential Value of a Citywide Survey
13	Goals of a Comprehensive Survey
14	How to Accomplish a Comprehensive Citywide Survey?
16	Priorities for Los Angeles
19	Survey Cost
19	Funding Support
20	Economic Benefits
20	Survey Time Frame
21	Conclusion
22	Reference Information
22	Review of Comparative Historic Resource Surveys
24	Incentives to Property Owners and Others in the Rehabilitation of Historic Properties and Revitalization of Historic Areas
25	Certified Local Governments
25	Relative Costs of Surveys
26	Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs)
28	Inventory of Previously Conducted Surveys
31	Bibliography
32	List of Individuals Interviewed for the Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project

PREFACE

In 1962 Los Angeles enacted its Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance calling for the survey and maintenance of historic properties throughout the city. The ordinance was enacted as plans for the clearance of Bunker Hill were being formulated. In the nearly forty years since, there have been dramatic changes in historic preservation and urban development. Urban development has all but abandoned the clearance tactics of the 1960s, and historic preservation has evolved from a focus on monuments and museums to encompass a broader sense of community, environment, and cultural heritage.

Los Angeles's early foresight in recognizing the importance of a strong cultural resource program saved many buildings that today are among its most beloved landmarks. However, the survey that was called for in the 1962 ordinance has yet to be realized, despite the fact that it would now have greater value than ever before. Nonetheless, individual, unrelated survey initiatives have expanded dramatically as developers adapt historic buildings to new uses; as property owners and neighborhood groups initiate Historic Preservation Overlay Zones; and as nonprofit organizations such as the Los Angeles Conservancy promote the value of the city's architectural heritage.

In the Getty Conservation Institute's work around the world, we have learned that historic resource surveys are the backbone of preservation and community development. They are the fundamental element in identifying what a community values. They serve as a critical conservation planning tool, and they inform the future growth of the city and its neighborhoods. In Los Angeles, a citywide survey and a strong, focused preservation program would enable the community to reduce the many conflicts that arise over what merits preservation and to employ its historic resources to help address issues of urban revitalization, community preservation, business retention, and civic pride.

Cities across the nation now recognize that the preservation and use of their built heritage promotes civic unity; contributes to tangible improvements in property values; leads to the expansion of cultural tourism; and accelerates the reclamation and revitalization of underutilized properties and districts. Despite a history of active and successful preservation work in

Los Angeles, the lack of fundamental information documenting the value of the city's history and architectural heritage has inhibited the realization of the benefits enumerated above.

Given this need, the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) commissioned Kathryn Welch Howe (KWH) in August 2000 to conduct a three-part study of the potential for a citywide survey. A nationally recognized expert in historic preservation and real estate, KWH has worked with communities across the country to identify and generate investment in previously unrecognized and underutilized properties. The six-month study included an assessment of current survey practices in Los Angeles, a review of comparable experiences in other cities nationally, and the development of a framework to consider the challenges and opportunities associated with a survey. The report that follows here summarizes the original three-part study prepared for the Getty Conservation Institute by KWH.

The Summary Report of the Los Angeles Historic Resource Survey Assessment Project begins with a review of the findings of the study, followed by background relating to the history of previously conducted surveys in Los Angeles and a description of the project's methodology. Project methodology included a review of past surveys and current practice in Los Angeles, interviews with practitioners and stakeholders in the survey and land use process, and a definition of the prospective role and value of a future survey. Reference information includes the salient points derived from the comparative review of surveys and preservation programs in other cities, a listing of incentives available for historic preservation efforts, current local protection programs, and the basic administrative framework for historic preservation.

The GCI and KWH wish to acknowledge the important contributions of a wide range of individuals, organizations, and agencies to this project. In conducting this research, every effort was made to obtain the viewpoints of elected officials, professionals, and neighborhood, industry, and civic leaders in order to accurately and fairly present conditions and opportunities. We want to thank the individuals listed in the appendix to this report for their thoughtful assistance and counsel.

In addition, we especially wish to thank the professional peer group that read the document prior to publication. Their sense of issues and urgency was most helpful in bringing this summary report to publication.

The Getty Conservation Institute is publishing this summary in recognition of the compelling findings of the Survey Assessment Project. The facts obtained through the project provide important material for leaders and decision makers in Los Angeles to consider as they develop the goals and methods by which Los Angeles manages its cultural heritage and its community development efforts. I hope the findings provide a framework for dialogue within the Los Angeles community and among the groups with interests in the community revitalization process.

I am very much indebted to Kathryn for the dedication, knowledge, and energy she brought to the Survey Assessment Project. In addition, several Getty Conservation Institute staff members made important contributions to this effort. Chris Seki provided invaluable research and documentation of survey legislation and previous surveys. Rand Eppich, the geographic information systems specialist with GCI, supported both Kathryn and Chris in mapping and quantifying the extent of previous survey work in Los Angeles. All three have my appreciation.

As part of the study, the Getty examined its own role in a citywide survey project. Given the project's potential size and complexity, it would require the involvement and assistance of a consortium of partners. The Getty is interested in helping to develop and work with that partnership to enlist community support, to convene professional expertise, and to help develop resources to implement the survey and preservation program.

We encourage your careful review of this document and look forward to the opportunity to discuss its findings and to better understand how we as a community can preserve Los Angeles's remarkable built legacy.

Timothy P. Whalen
Director
Getty Conservation Institute

INTRODUCTION

In August 2000 the Getty Conservation Institute commissioned a study of the potential for a comprehensive historic resource survey of the City of Los Angeles. The study was to look at whether and how such a survey should and could be implemented and to identify the various factors that contribute to the successful completion of such surveys.

The reasons for the Getty's interest in a Los Angeles historic resource survey were twofold. First, over the past fifteen years, the Getty has supported a number of organizations and projects that represent the rich, diverse heritage of Los Angeles through its Preserve LA grant initiative, the Save America's Treasures Preservation Planning Fund, and a range of internships, grants, and educational initiatives. This experience has illustrated that Los Angeles has a wealth of resources that are unrecognized, underutilized, and frequently threatened and that there are no regular mechanisms to identify significant resources and anticipate their preservation and reuse.

Second, the connection between research and conservation is essential. As seen locally and around the world, research and documentation are essential to establish judgments concerning property significance and to give direction to preservation efforts. A historic resource survey can illuminate the historic character of the city and its component areas and generate a productive dialogue between community, government, and investment interests as to the appropriate strategies to maintain and enhance important assets within the framework of other planning and development programs.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Survey Assessment Project identified preservation policies and practices that merit discussion. The findings and conclusions that emerged from the project are of special note:

1. Historic Properties are Cultural and Capital Assets

Los Angeles has an abundance of historic buildings, districts, and areas that have substantial architectural, historic, and cultural interest. These resources are among Los Angeles's most important cultural and capital assets. Identifying them may present a range of opportunities to unify the city, to build community appreciation of the extraordinary historical development and architectural heritage of the city, and to expand recognition of the city's rich and diverse cultural heritage. The identification of significant resources may also contribute meaningfully to community development and economic revitalization goals.

2. Less Than 15 Percent of Los Angeles Has Been Surveyed

Although Los Angeles has had a cultural heritage ordinance since 1962, less than 15 percent of the city has been surveyed (see pp. 28–30). The surveys completed to date can form an important foundation for future survey work, despite the fact that prior surveys were created for varying purposes, used different methodologies, and reflect substantial variance in what was considered significant. Use of prior surveys may reduce the time and cost of a comprehensive citywide survey.

3. Population Increase: Pressures and Opportunities

By the year 2010, Los Angeles's population is expected to increase by nearly one million people, the largest projected increase in urban population in the country. This will place tremendous pressures on the city's historic neighborhoods and historic properties for reuse or replacement. With a historic resource survey

and anticipatory planning tools and incentives, the opportunity to use historic properties for housing, offices, retail, and industry could expand dramatically.

4. Importance of Comprehensive Surveys

There is a range of types of historic resource surveys and an equally wide range of uses to which survey information may be put. Current surveys are directed at compiling data related to specific projects, primarily to fulfill regulatory requirements—whether to establish Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) or to move development projects through the environmental review process. On a citywide basis, these ad hoc surveys have created an inconsistent patchwork of data, have limited public value, and are very expensive. Optimally, the historic resource survey should develop data that is applicable to a variety of purposes including nominations, education, regulatory compliance, and community planning.

5. Survey Links to Community Goals

A historic resource survey should be considered the first step in a larger, dynamic process, not an end in itself. Survey data, integrated with other community planning and development information, can contribute to developing logical planning and investment objectives over time. Such objectives relate not only to community revitalization, economic development, and cultural heritage but also to education, tourism and conservation, among others.

6. Positive Economic Results

There is also a positive economic justification for a citywide survey and preservation program. Research conducted nationally has illustrated the salutary impact of historic preservation on property values and tax revenues, benefits that have been achieved while maintaining community diversity. A survey would reduce last-minute development problems for those with

construction plans. Late discovery of historic buildings on development sites can lead to difficult-to-resolve conflicts for city government.

7. Broad Support for a Citywide Survey

The Survey Assessment Project revealed nearly unanimous support from a wide range of public and private interests for a citywide historic resource survey. City agencies can utilize such data in project planning and permit and review processes; community groups and property owners can use the information to engage in education and property planning, and to protect and improve their homes and neighborhoods; and the real estate community views it as integral to “smart growth” and increasing certainty in the development process. The absence of reliable data is recognized as a source of risk and conflict in community and economic development projects.

8. Necessity of Focused Leadership

The two city agencies responsible for historic resource surveys have fulfilled their responsibilities in a reasonable manner given resource constraints and past political support. However, splitting historic preservation responsibilities within city government departments deprives Los Angeles of the leadership necessary for a functional preservation program, results in a lack of accountability, and is ultimately unworkable. Leadership, focus, and adequate resources are necessary to conduct the research, articulate the value of the city’s heritage, assist property owners, and work collaboratively with other agencies and private interests, and to build upon survey findings.

9. Cost Benefits of a Citywide Survey

Spending on surveys by public and private interests is estimated at over one million dollars per year, and yet the city has little to show for it. Estimated costs associated with a comprehensive survey and a well-managed preservation program appear reasonable in comparison.

10. Existing Strengths in Los Angeles

Los Angeles has a number of notable strengths with respect to a prospective citywide survey and preservation program. These include the compelling success of HPOZS within neighborhoods representing a broad range of ethnic, social, and economic conditions. Another asset is the strength of private and nonprofit sector partners, such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and the growing group of investors and professionals experienced in historic preservation. Finally the Department of City Planning’s parcel-based Geographic Information System (GIS) may provide an important tool to integrate survey information with other property-related information, thus facilitating one-stop review of all pertinent information on a property.

11. Foundation and Corporate Support

There may be the opportunity to establish partnerships with private sector and charitable foundation interests to help support the costs of a citywide survey and preservation program. Foundations contacted expressed their interest in a survey that is tied to broader goals for neighborhood conservation and community revitalization.

12. Incentives for Historic Preservation

There are numerous financial and development incentives available to property owners and investors in historic properties that are currently underutilized in Los Angeles due in part to the lack of information and technical assistance available (see p. 24). With such information and assistance, many communities have expanded the type and target of their preservation incentives with impressive results, both economic and in terms of the community itself.

Los Angeles has a strong base of preservation work on which to build. The Survey Assessment Project documented the impressive work that neighborhood groups have undertaken to create fifteen historic districts

(HPOZs) in areas ranging from Western Heights in South Central Los Angeles, Highland Park in East Los Angeles, and Vinegar Hill in San Pedro to the proposed districts in Van Nuys and Hancock Park. It acknowledged the extraordinary efforts of investors such as Urban Partners, Wayne Ratkovich, Gilmore Associates, and the Los Angeles Community Design Center, among others, while also recognizing the challenges posed to development projects, as in the case of the Chase Knolls Garden Apartments. The Survey Assessment Project also identified the important work of the Los Angeles Conservancy, the recently formed HPOZ Alliance, and numerous local groups to lead and support preservation efforts.

The project observed that in Los Angeles effectiveness in preservation must be based upon partnership and collaborative action between the public and private and nonprofit sectors. This “triple play” of activity relies upon the strengths and participation of each sector. Many of the city’s Business Improvement Districts and the Los Angeles Conservancy’s Downtown Initiative Project, focused on Broadway and Spring Streets, proactively engage property owners, developers, and the city’s public agencies in developing area plans and implementation projects. Such private and community-based efforts would be greatly assisted by a unified survey and effective public preservation program.

All indicators suggest that a strong, balanced, collaborative preservation process in Los Angeles would allow the city to realize the value of its historic resources economically and in terms of civic pride and improvements, that new markets and a market context for rehabilitation projects could be established, that community engagement and economic revitalization could work hand-in-hand, and that confidence in the city’s architectural heritage could encourage and celebrate new development and new architecture as contemporary expressions of the city’s dynamic architectural tradition.

The Getty Conservation Institute has prepared this report in recognition of the important cultural resources in Los Angeles and on the basis of its own experience as a cultural institution assisting a wide range of preservation and revitalization efforts. The

Survey Assessment Project has clearly indicated the importance of a survey and preservation program to the City of Los Angeles. It identifies a range of opportunities and issues that must be addressed through dialogue among community leaders.

The Getty has offered to work in partnership with the city to enlist community support, to convene professional expertise, to help resolve key issues, to assure high professional standards, and to help develop resources to address the multiple elements associated with establishing a survey and preservation program. This Summary Report is intended to provide a framework for that dialogue.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN LOS ANGELES

Los Angeles enacted its Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance in 1962 and for a time appeared to be in the vanguard nationally in its commitment to historic preservation. It rapidly designated a number of prominent landmarks, but due to the absence of planning to make effective use of listed buildings, many of these were ultimately destroyed or threatened with demolition, including the Richard J. Riordan Central Library, the May Company Building, and the Cathedral of Saint Vibiana.

In 1979, reflecting the significant shift in historic preservation and community planning to address areas and districts of architectural and historical significance, the Los Angeles City Council adopted the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone Ordinance with revisions in 1997. The number of HPOZs has grown from eight local districts in 1997 to a current fifteen. The movement to establish HPOZs is rooted in the renewal of neighborhood pride and the desire of property owners to assume responsibility for their neighborhoods.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was established in 1970 with revisions completed in 1998. CEQA requires public agencies and private applicants making discretionary decisions to assess the impact on the environment including historic resources. Projects such as the expansion of the Fox Studios, the development of Playa Vista, and many surveys conducted by the Community Redevelopment Agency and the Metropolitan Transportation Agency identified important, previously unsurveyed historic properties.

Contemporary, citywide preservation began with the creation of the Los Angeles Conservancy in 1978. Formed to educate and advocate on behalf of the city's architectural heritage, the Conservancy has been instrumental in successfully promoting the preservation of Los Angeles's, historic properties and districts and supporting local preservation and neighborhood organizations. The latter are numerous and include such groups as the West Adams Heritage Association and Hollywood Heritage Inc., which are focused specifically on preservation education in their respective areas.

THE SITUATION IN LOS ANGELES TODAY

Today, despite the auspicious beginning on the part of the private sector, historic preservation practices in

Los Angeles are at a crossroads. On one hand, neighborhoods are clamoring to achieve the community, economic, and marketing benefits that accompany the designation "historic district" (Historic Preservation Overlay Zone, or HPOZ); a host of new investors, "preservation developers," are pouring millions of dollars into Downtown Los Angeles, Hollywood, the Miracle Mile, and other of the city's historic areas; and appreciation of the distinctive contributions that Los Angeles has made to architecture and cultural history is growing. On the other hand, conflicts and skirmishes regarding "what is historic" continue to breed distrust and lawsuits; the lack of adequate support for neighborhood and developer initiatives aimed at preservation and reuse of valuable resources has engendered frustration and disappointment; and the protections afforded the historic resources of Los Angeles have grown demonstrably weaker.

Although Los Angeles agencies such as the Cultural Heritage Commission and the Department of City Planning have authority for carrying out municipal preservation responsibilities, they have been placed in a difficult position. The Cultural Heritage Commission has a staff of 1.5 professionals to review proposed alterations to over seven hundred designated structures, to consider nominations of other properties meriting designation as Historic-Cultural Monuments, to comment on certificates of appropriateness for proposed changes to five thousand HPOZ properties, and to administer 118 Mills Act contracts. In general, The Cultural Heritage Commission makes designations in response to owners' requests. While owner participation is very desirable, this creates a designation program that lacks coherence.

At this time the Department of City Planning has three planner assistants responsible for supporting the fifteen HPOZ advisory boards and reviewing proposed changes to over five thousand properties within the current HPOZs. The number of these properties is expected to more than double with the designation of nine more HPOZs, which are currently in the planning stage.

The obstacles confronted by these agencies are compounded by the fact that agreed-upon standards for determining historic and architectural merit have

METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED BY THE LOS ANGELES HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY ASSESSMENT PROJECT

yet to be developed, an ad hoc approach to defining areas and properties of significance is utilized, and a lack of adequate training exists for the limited personnel and review bodies.

These factors render Los Angeles unable to initiate or effectively support the opportunities presented by property owners and developers who seek to stabilize neighborhoods and invest in historic properties. The absence of a proactive, professionally constituted preservation program and survey has established a pattern of inadequate appraisals, last-minute interpretations, and limited negotiating room in the designation and review process. This has resulted in the destruction of important buildings along with the erosion of community trust and loss of investment dollars. Organizations such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and local neighborhood groups may comment upon a property's significance without adequate information and develop positions as reactive, rear-guard actions.

The Survey Assessment Project examined the survey programs and listing practices of the Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, the California Register of Historic Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places. It also reviewed the data management practices of the Department of City Planning's Geographic Information System (GIS) and the California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS).

In addition to this records search, over fifty agency representatives, public officials, officers of community organizations and foundations, representatives of the real estate community, and civic leaders were interviewed to discuss the surveys and to clarify the link between historic resource surveys and: (1) designation as a significant resource, (2) environmental review, (3) community planning, and (4) development processes. The interview process also ascertained the level of interest in a citywide historic resources survey and its potential value (see pp. 32–34).

The project identified all available survey work completed since the passage of the Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance in 1962, including surveys that were underway or in planning or proposal stages (see pp. 28–30). Through this process, it became possible to delineate unsurveyed areas as well as those for which surveys should be updated or repeated. With the assistance of CHRIS and other data resources, a map illustrating the areas surveyed to date was prepared in digitized form.

HISTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF THE SURVEYS CONDUCTED IN LOS ANGELES TO DATE

The Survey Assessment Project found that less than 15 percent of the city of Los Angeles has been surveyed or assessed for its historically significant resources. Past surveys have been completed on an ad hoc basis by numerous public agencies over a thirty-year period, and the methods and evaluation standards applied in each have differed considerably. The fact that these numerous public agencies relied on an even greater number of private survey firms—reflecting varied interpretations of National Register survey standards, which are subjective by design—perpetuated further inconsistency. Agency providers and users of currently available historic-resource-survey data report that the information is difficult to locate, to obtain, and to use. As a consequence, current survey practices in Los Angeles are highly limited in scope and value to the community and to the preservation, planning, and development processes.

The chronology of prior historic resource surveys in Los Angeles illustrates a pattern of surveying that has been largely project or property specific and has not followed a systematic course in purpose or methodology or official adoption. The result is that while areas of the city have been surveyed, the official historic resource database as represented by the California Historic Resource Information System (CHRIS) lists no properties surveyed after 1990 and has significant gaps in surveys conducted prior to that time. A listing of past surveys is set forth in the Inventory of Previously Conducted Surveys (see pp. 28–30).

The history of surveys in Los Angeles can be divided roughly into three eras: (1) the post-1962 preservation ordinance adoption period in which committees of dedicated volunteers identified and prepared nominations for historic and endangered properties to be listed as Historic-Cultural Monuments; (2) the late 1980s–early 1990s when five areas of the city were surveyed at a reconnaissance level by consultants working for the Department of City Planning as part of the Community Plan Revision process; and (3) the late 1990s to the present, the period in which HPOZ surveys commissioned by the Department of City Planning were conducted in response to the interest expressed by neighborhoods and City Council

representatives seeking to establish HPOZs in areas of architectural and historical interest. Since 1970, government agencies and private interests have conducted surveys to fulfill the requirements under CEQA to identify, evaluate, register, and protect historic resources, most of this in connection with specific project activity.

The most comprehensive and accessible effort to make available information about historic resources has been developed by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning through its Geographic Information System (GIS). The GIS includes a map identifying locally designated “Historic-Cultural Monuments” and Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs). The GIS is available on the Internet (<http://www.lacity.org/PLN>). If further developed, this mapping database could prove to be an important resource of historically significant properties throughout Los Angeles.

CURRENT SURVEY PRACTICES IN LOS ANGELES

At this time, survey practices in Los Angeles are pragmatic and narrow in scope, administration, and utility. At the behest of the City Council, the Department of City Planning retains professional firms to survey areas of the city that council members and their constituencies view as historic. Professional survey firms are hired to determine the merit of these areas as HPOZs and to identify the “contributing structures” within those potential zones.

The Cultural Heritage Commission does not employ a survey to identify properties that may be eligible for listing as Historic-Cultural Monuments or for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources. The absence of a survey based upon sound criteria is particularly problematic in the case of Historic-Cultural Monument nominations. It may be an invitation to bias and does not contribute to balanced judgments.

There are as well numerous ad hoc project-related surveys conducted by the public and private sector in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). These project-specific surveys represent considerable expenditure of time and funds in the service of surveying historic resources, yet they are not coordinated, nor are the data compiled, organized, and made accessible through a public database.

Public involvement in the survey process is in general limited. Public hearings, which are required by ordinance, are conducted during the process of designating HPOZs and Historic-Cultural Monuments. There is, however, limited public discourse or education at the survey or review board level as to the themes and criteria that contribute to an assessment of significance. Despite these conditions, the number of HPOZs has recently increased from nine to fifteen with nine more in the planning stages; and recently, the advisory HPOZ Boards have begun to formalize their network.

Similarly, the Cultural Heritage Commission has continued to review nominations and to designate Historic-Cultural Monuments. In the past five years approximately eighty-six properties have been designated. The nominations come from the public rather than from survey work. As this report was being

published, the Los Angeles City Council approved a motion on July 8, 2001, to direct the Los Angeles City Attorney to develop a preservation ordinance to meet the requirements of the Certified Local Governments program (see p. 25). This proposed ordinance, if developed and approved, may provide Los Angeles with a mechanism to administer the comprehensive survey and preservation program with an appropriate level of professionalism.

THE POTENTIAL VALUE OF A CITYWIDE SURVEY

The historic resource survey serves as the fundamental component of a preservation infrastructure. The value of a survey conducted on a citywide or regional basis is that it allows decision makers to look at resources in context, permitting them to better evaluate significance, to prioritize, and to diffuse conflicts that can occur when resources are looked at in a microcosm. Currently the public, developers, and public agencies responsible for reviewing project plans and issuing permits have extremely limited information and no systematic, official resources or method to ascertain the potential significance or sensitivity of undesignated properties.

The survey will provide research, documentation, and data on the important historic resources within the city. It establishes the balance and emphasis to assess what is significant and to present the means to recognize, protect, and reuse important resources, whether individual properties or whole areas or neighborhoods. A survey begins the process of codifying and organizing a framework to link preservation and reuse priorities. It leads to specific programs and plans to expand public awareness, to guide the development process, and to stimulate public and private investment in historic properties and districts.

SURVEY METHODS

Survey methods can vary in emphasis and in results. The basic components include planning and background research to establish a historic context and analytical framework to guide property assessments, fieldwork and factual documentation, organization and presentation of data, and evaluation of resources and the development of an inventory. Surveys can be designed to serve a range of purposes—as narrative and visual guides to the key themes and physical manifestations of a community’s history, road maps for future development, and, more pragmatically, as data to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local regulations.

SURVEY LEADERSHIP

Appropriate leadership and follow-up are central factors in realizing a citywide survey. The survey sponsor should be empowered to develop and mine

survey findings to expand the community’s awareness of its architectural and cultural heritage and to use that information to create an integral role for historic resources in the city’s future development.

The leadership should recognize that many of the city’s most historic properties are in its poorer, undermaintained areas. Sensitivity to maintenance costs and the usefulness of rehabilitation incentives to assist property owners can produce important improvements in neighborhood quality and help prevent economic dislocations.

The connection between survey process and implementation is critical. Over the past three decades literally millions of dollars have been spent on historic resource surveys in Los Angeles by a range of agencies and interests involved in land use. Yet, the city has little to show for it in the way of a common resource, a universal database, and a common set of local standards. The absence of leadership and administration, the lack of consolidation, interpretation, and maintenance of survey data, and the absence of follow-up in education, nominations, and preservation planning have rendered the survey process and the data gathered to date not only expensive but also limited in terms of their public, policy, and planning purposes.

The Survey Assessment Project concluded that while it may appear expedient to continue the current process and practices, to do so would not yield the desired results. If a citywide historic resource survey is to be undertaken in Los Angeles, there must be a public policy mandate to justify the undertaking and resources to give it the requisite professional direction. Los Angeles needs a survey and preservation program with a mandate, staff, and resources commensurate with the scope and complexity of the city’s architectural and cultural resources and of the Los Angeles community itself.

GOALS OF A COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY

A comprehensive historic resource survey should represent best national practices and fulfill the following requisites:

1. Historic Context Statement

Develop a historic context statement that articulates the broad patterns of historical development in the city and defines the structure of the survey.

2. Identify Significant Properties and Areas

Identify properties and districts that significantly contribute to the city's character or to that of its neighborhoods, or that illustrate its historical or architectural development and, as a result, deserve consideration in planning.

3. Establish Evaluation Standards and Inventory

Develop an evaluation framework to determine whether properties meet defined criteria of historical, architectural, archaeological, or cultural significance. Develop an inventory—an organized compilation of information on those resources that are evaluated as significant.

4. Establish Priorities and Action

Establish priorities for conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation.

5. Associate Incentives and Designations

Provide the basis for using legal and financial tools to protect and enhance historic resources. These include such actions as nominations for Historic-Cultural Monument status, establishment of HPOZS, and listing in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Places. It might also include the utilization of such tools and incentives as preservation easements, the Mills Act, the Investment Tax Credit for Rehabilitation, and so forth (see p. 24). Further it might lead to the development of tools such as revolving loan funds and incentive zoning techniques.

6. Develop Accessible Database

Provide communities, planners, and investors with a database from which to monitor and channel maintenance, rehabilitation, and development.

7. Increase Public Awareness

Increase awareness among the public and private sectors of the value of the resources and the need for preservation or reuse.

8. Streamline Review Process

Enable local government and state and federal agencies to meet their planning and review responsibilities under existing legislation and procedures, more efficiently and more economically.

Although the existing system in Los Angeles may represent best efforts given resource constraints and past political support, it deprives the community of a responsible record of the city's historic resources and a compelling vision of their value. Inconsistent survey methods and evaluation standards create substantial variance in what is considered significant, and the resultant perception of inconsistency and unpredictability has led to frustration and conflict. The absence of a public database of surveyed properties can also contribute significantly to conflicts in project review and increase the planning costs for public or privately sponsored projects. Development of legal and financial tools that could yield broad economic and community benefits could be based upon the specific conditions and needs identified through the survey.

With any survey, there will be legitimate questions pertaining to judgments of significance and preservation. The cost of resolving such questions will be borne by the individual project proponent and the individual public agency. A well-developed, comprehensive survey will, however, allow the community to place questions of criteria, standards, and evaluations of merit squarely in the most capable hands to enable a resolution reflecting a balance of public and private needs—rather than one based on the negotiating power of the individual players in a particular project context.

HOW TO ACCOMPLISH A COMPREHENSIVE CITYWIDE SURVEY?

The Survey Assessment Project addressed the issue of how a comprehensive survey project might be accomplished given its potential size, duration, and complexity. KWH assessed the role of existing agencies and organizations in the process, conducted a broad range of interviews in the Los Angeles planning, preservation, and development community, and researched the experience of other communities, nationally and statewide. The most significant factors within a survey process were found to be:

1. Impartiality and Objectivity

The use of factual data, research, photography, and a review system that includes input and filtering by recognized experts provide the basis for establishing a credible survey process. Ratings by individual survey consultants are diminishing in use in favor of a property evaluation process that incorporates the input of a variety of professionals and community representatives. The most trusted process appears to be one in which there is review by professional staff and commissioners with expertise in architectural history, history, archaeology, architecture, and other fields appropriate to the historic context of the community at both staff and commission levels. The evaluation occurs at the time of inclusion in an inventory or at designation.

2. Agreed-Upon Standards

Survey and evaluation standards are critical to public understanding of the criteria for considering a property significant. Consistent, coherent application of the survey standards and the evaluation process over time is essential to developing credibility.

3. Well-Maintained and Administered Process

The survey and inventory are lists that must be maintained and administered over time. Survey data and the database will be constantly used, refined and augmented. The development and management of data will make the survey a multifaceted resource suitable for a broad range of users: public agencies, property owners, investors, and neighborhood groups, as well as researchers and planners. Use of the survey for community education and to identify use and development alternatives for historic properties will enhance perception of its value. Evaluation of resources will be continuously refined by ongoing research. For example surveys of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s neglected Modernist architecture and vernacular architecture in favor of Victorian era and earlier resources. Current survey work is challenged to develop evaluation standards for such postwar contributions as production housing and transportation systems.

4. Engagement of the Community

Community involvement in the survey process can frequently help build support for a survey and preservation program. Bringing the community into the survey process in a way that engenders community knowledge, appreciation, and support for survey recommendations and historic preservation is a critical element in a prospective Los Angeles survey. Different communities may participate in different ways. Typically community members assist with research, provide historical photographs, identify architectural changes and structures previously undocumented, and build community support working with professional survey teams and the responsible public agencies. In reconnaissance surveys or thematic surveys, stakeholder groups are identified and incorporated in the survey process. Neighborhood councils established within the Los Angeles City Charter may represent important resources in the survey.

5. Leadership and Support

Adequate resources and support must be marshaled to ensure the highest professional standards while conducting the survey and preservation planning process. The administrators of the survey must correlate survey data with financial, legal, planning, and development processes and assume a strong leadership role working with survey consultants and stakeholders. Support for the survey should come from both public and private interests. Such varied support will produce a survey process and decisions reflective of the community and its needs.

6. Public Access

The survey process, data, database, and decision-making need to be accessible to the public. Publications, Web sites, and community relations efforts can increase support for the methods and uses of the survey. Further development of the city's GIS system to include survey data and integrate correlation with CHRIS will provide important and effective use of survey data.

"Friendly," informative Web sites, such as that in use by the Texas Historical Commission, can expand public use and appreciation of the resources by property owners, residents, and visitors.

PRIORITIES FOR LOS ANGELES

As a result of its analysis, the Survey Assessment project has determined the following priorities for the development of an effective historic resource survey in Los Angeles.

PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AND FOCUS

The structure of leadership and the ongoing management of the survey will be essential to its success. The survey is only the first step in a broader process. The key leadership functions must be to support, administer, and maintain the ongoing survey; ensure its quality and use through research, evaluation, and nomination procedures; develop community dialogue and education; provide input to the GIS database; and work with other agencies and community interests to develop an effective role and integrate preservation. The following represent differing possibilities that might allow for the achievement of these ends:

Consolidation of Preservation Functions

A separate Los Angeles Preservation Commission with a strong and skilled preservation staff could be created to coordinate the survey, nomination, project review, and data development functions that are currently dispersed among other city agencies. This practice of consolidation has been consistently implemented in other United States cities that have achieved success in their historic preservation programs (see p. 22). It will adopt the monuments and HPOZs that have been previously designated.

Creation of an Independent Los Angeles Historic Resource Research Center

The Historic Resource Research Center—originating within the public or nonprofit sector—could be linked to the Cultural Heritage Commission and the Department of City Planning and would supplement and support the work of those agencies through research and review responsibilities. This entity might sponsor and conduct the survey.

Maintaining and Growing Existing Programs

The existing alignment of responsibilities would be continued. Support would need to be built for adequate, professionally trained staffs and review board(s) with a range of expertise that would enable them to conduct the survey, maintain the data, carry out project and design review, and assure continued development.

ENCOURAGING COALITION SUPPORT

The preservation survey should seek support and participation from allied groups and stakeholders within the public and private sectors. This coalition of interests can help develop support for the survey project and establish consensus for survey goals, methods, and findings. In the course of the Survey Assessment Project, the following groups were identified as key stakeholders and expressed interest in the project:

Los Angeles Office of the Mayor
Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles Conservancy
HPOZ Alliance
American Institute of Architects,
 Los Angeles Chapter
Urban Land Institute
Neighborhood Councils
City Agencies:
 Department of Cultural Affairs
 Department of City Planning
 Department of Building and Safety
 Community Redevelopment Agency
Academic Institutions
Business Associations
Charitable Foundations
Museums
Historical Societies
Religious Organizations

DETERMINING METHODOLOGY

There are a number of ways to structure a historic resource survey. Questions of methodology must be addressed early on to determine an appropriate scope for the survey (e.g., the types of resources to be surveyed, the kinds of information to be gathered, optimum use and storage of survey data).

The survey's purpose and end use must be clearly defined and understood so that standards and practices are consistently exercised and clearly interpreted. Among the most important elements of the survey process to establish are:

Evaluation Framework

Los Angeles needs a citywide historic context statement that outlines primary themes, development periods, and architectural traditions that are determined to be significant. Evaluation can then be made concerning the relationship of a particular resource to this established context. This framework will be the first step in developing standards and criteria (see below). Specific context statements related to individual areas and types of resources might be developed as part of the phasing of the reconnaissance and intensive level survey.

Standards and Criteria

Consistent application of standards is essential to the survey process. The criteria established in the National Register are used by many communities in association with local historic context statements to develop locally meaningful standards and criteria for evaluating resources.

Resources Protection

The link between the survey and nominations should be clarified and strengthened. Development of a process to recognize a property's status as "eligible for listing," might include protections and a time-sensitive plan for nomination.

Resources Definition

Establishing what attributes and values are considered significant is essential to the survey process. How, for example, can a survey successfully capture properties and areas of cultural rather than architectural significance? Consideration of Historic-Cultural Monument status for such properties as the Holiday Bowl in the Crenshaw District, the Hellman Cabin former movie set in Rustic Canyon, or the Brooklyn Avenue neighborhood corridor in Boyle Heights has raised challenging questions regarding the cultural heritage emphasis that is apparent in the city's preservation program. Similarly, works from the recent past, such as Post-World War II suburban tract housing or vernacular "Googie" architecture require an evaluation framework. Dialogue and resolution of these issues will allow these resources to be dispassionately evaluated in the survey stage rather than later at the nomination and designation stage. Such dialogue might also identify alternate ways of recognizing certain types of important properties and areas outside of the historic resource classifications, for example, as Conservation Advisory Districts.

Resources Classification

There are multiple classifications of the significance of historic resources. Each of these affords a certain level of protection and recognition. Some communities use classification as a strategy for designation. Dallas, for example, initially completes the research to list its resources in the National Register and then when this listing is granted makes use of it as a "selling tool" to achieve local investment and designation. New York, however, designates locally first because of its stated goal of protecting and reviewing alterations to historic properties. Los Angeles needs to clarify how it will use the interrelationships of the various classifications.

Survey Archives

Maintenance and development of survey archives and the database are essential to the further development of factual information on historic resources. At this time in Los Angeles, survey archives seem to be held in the files of the various agencies and consultants. Survey archives contain data including photographs, permit information, research, and a range of other information developed as part of evaluating significance and reviewing changes to the property. Without this information, it is impossible to make evaluative judgments on significance and proposed architectural changes.

Survey Database

Currently, the Los Angeles City Council has directed the Department of City Planning to maintain an official database of locally designated historic property (Historic-Cultural Monuments and HPOZs) on the city's GIS. There is tremendous value in a citywide database that includes survey information and the different types of resource classification associated with the individual property. For environmental review purposes as well as public information, consideration should be given to aligning the survey process with the GIS parcel mapping system so that survey information is included for every parcel for which a survey was conducted. A link to, or preferably integration with, CHRIS would produce maximum effective use and exchange of important data.

Survey Priorities

The citywide survey may be able to consolidate and build upon the data developed by the many prior surveys. Although these are by no means comprehensive, some historic areas of the city, such as downtown, have been surveyed. Decisions about priority and the order in which resources should be surveyed must be made, and these can be based upon those areas of Los Angeles known to contain dense concentrations of historic resources and threatened or distinctive properties. Thematic surveys that focus upon a particular building type (e.g., schools, fire stations), architectural period, or style might also be considered as priorities are established.

Conducting the Survey

Public and nonprofessional involvement should be defined and carefully integrated in the survey. Involving the public can take many forms and affect cost, timing, staff, and survey structure. Although local historical societies, preservation organizations, and neighborhood councils vary in their capacities and priorities, these groups represent important resources for local surveys.

SURVEY COST

The structure and scope of the survey determine its cost. A survey process should maximize use of existing survey data including those surveys already enumerated on the “Inventory of Previously Conducted Surveys” (pp. 28–30) and those obtainable from recent Environmental Impact Reports and local historical associations.

Establishing the cost of the survey will mean taking into account the projected time frame, the size of survey areas, and type and depth of information to be gathered. Other factors—including administrative expenses and salaries for personnel and consultants—will need to be estimated. At this juncture, estimates of survey costs are premature.

As part of the Survey Assessment Project, a range of survey types and their associated costs were reviewed and provide useful reference (see p. 25). This analysis indicated the cost of a survey can range from a low of twenty-five dollars per property for HPOZ surveys to a high of approximately five hundred dollars per property for CEQA-related surveys. The cost of a citywide survey would include the initial reconnaissance-level surveys followed over time by more intensive survey work related to nominations and project review. It is expected that an ongoing survey process and preservation program would reduce costs to the city and private interests.

FUNDING SUPPORT

Public agencies have provided funding for nearly all the surveys identified in the Survey Assessment Project. Sources have included the Los Angeles General Fund, various agency project budgets (Community Redevelopment Agency, Metropolitan Transportation Agency, etc.), Community Development Block Grant funds, and the California Office of Historic Preservation.

Preliminary discussions with a small sample group of private foundations indicated potential interest in partnership funding for a citywide survey if survey goals were to relate to neighborhood empowerment and community revitalization. There are a number of ways in which the survey effort could enlist private foundation and corporate support, including conventional fundraising and project sponsorship. Partnership relationships with private sponsors and public agencies in which surveys would be developed to citywide standards and incorporated within the city GIS database could also be considered.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

The economic justification for historic preservation is based on actual market response and financial results. Nationally, the number of adaptive use and commercial rehabilitation projects has grown from a few high-risk, hard-fought projects into a multibillion dollar industry in which nearly every real estate entity participates. The realization that making economic use of historic buildings is an effective preservation solution and frequently a financially and politically constructive way to create housing, offices, industrial space, etc., has caused preservation, community, and real estate interests to find common ground.

Economic studies conducted in other states (New Jersey and Texas) found that historic designation was associated with higher property values in all of the Certified Local Government communities studied. These studies also found that in dollar terms (dollar value change per housing unit), historic designation was associated with average increases in housing values exceeding 10 percent of the value prior to designation.

Further, recent studies in these same states show that the economic effects for public tax and funding incentives to historic preservation are more than offset by the enhanced tax revenues resulting from public investment. Professional economic analysis of the economic consequences of historic preservation has not yet been undertaken in Los Angeles. However anecdotal evidence suggests that the economic improvements noted in the New Jersey and Texas studies may be relevant and comparable.

An economic impact analysis is an important component of a comprehensive preservation program. Such an analysis, using the case method, might assess the effect of preservation and rehabilitation initiatives in commercial areas and neighborhoods. The analysis should cover a range of areas in terms of social, economic, and property conditions, researching those community areas that are experiencing investment interest and those that are seeking investment or working toward stability and incremental change. This would provide city leaders and community groups with valuable decision-making data allowing them to carefully calibrate their priorities and project support.

SURVEY TIME FRAME

The time frame for completion of the survey will need to be carefully assessed. Development of a reconnaissance level survey for previously unsurveyed areas, consolidation and selective updating of prior surveys, and surveys of resources on a thematic basis would need to be phased given constraints of staffing and resources and the methodologies employed. The reconnaissance level surveys could provide basic data and direction for future intensive level surveys. Comparing time frames of prior surveys along with proposed methodologies and uses of the survey will help establish realistic completion goals.

Expectations for completion of the survey should be based upon the concept that the survey will be continuous with many increments of “completion” for individual resources and areas.

CONCLUSION

Los Angeles has a unique opportunity to recognize its historic resources and to begin the process of incorporating them into its cultural and community revitalization goals. The caliber of resources, the compelling interest and initiative already demonstrated by the community, and the development of new technologies present the chance to realize the potential many envision for Los Angeles's historic resources.

This would include, for example, viewing such resources as the Eichler homes in the San Fernando Valley as catalysts for developing neighborhood pride in postwar housing developments or seeing the Vinegar Hill district in San Pedro as the starting point for broader neighborhood renewal. It would mean that property owners and investors who are motivated to maintain and adapt properties are meaningfully encouraged. Development projects would be informed early in the planning process—prior to the commitment of investment dollars—of the existence and sensitivities of key resources. It might also mean that challenging properties such as Van de Kamp's Bakery, the Herald-Examiner Building, or the Ambassador Hotel are assisted both with incentives and facilitation of a market context for preservation development efforts. Perhaps most important, Los Angeles could develop a responsible record of the city's past and a persuasive vision of its future. It could retain and employ significant historic properties while embracing new design and architecture as it has always done and always will.

The starting point in this process is the historic resource survey. The city simply cannot establish direction without first gathering clear data and a perspective on the resources it has. While there are technical and resource issues that must be addressed, they appear to be manageable. The central issue in achieving these goals is to establish the long-term capacity to administer the survey process and develop a preservation program for the city. To undertake the survey as a short-term project independent of other community planning, development, and political processes would perpetuate ineffectual past practices and deprive the city of the opportunity to achieve significant community, cultural, and economic benefits.

Within the community, there is substantial recognition of and support for a historic resource survey and a viable preservation program. The Survey Assessment Project identified a number of ways in which corporations, universities, preservation organizations, charitable foundations, and others might be able to assist and participate in the survey and preservation process. This support might include funding assistance, partnerships, and parallel programming. In order to develop these relationships, the City of Los Angeles will need to consider carefully the potential for a citywide survey and its support for a preservation program.

This cannot be accomplished alone. The J. Paul Getty Trust and others should work in partnership with the city to develop this opportunity for cultural heritage in Los Angeles. This report elicited the interest of a diverse range of community leaders and professionals who might form a working group to join together with the city to address and resolve the concerns and issues associated with a survey and preservation program.

REVIEW OF COMPARATIVE HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEYS

The Survey Assessment Project conducted a review of selected communities throughout the United States in order to gain a national perspective on the implications of a comprehensive survey for Los Angeles and to address key issues pertinent to Los Angeles. Seven cities were selected for review based upon the relevance of their experience to Los Angeles: Chicago, Dallas, New York, Oakland, Pasadena, Santa Monica, and Seattle. Although these communities vary greatly in terms of their history, geography, and social, political, and economic make-up, as well as the status of their preservation programs within local government, the comparative review provides insight into key themes and experiences useful for Los Angeles.

Correlation between Preservation and Community Development

The comparative review found an important correlation between the strength of the local historic preservation program and neighborhood stability and property investment. In fact, as observed in all surveyed cities—and most notably in Seattle, New York, and Chicago—a well-planned survey and preservation planning program can open new development opportunities and generate widespread neighborhood conservation and business development. The size and expertise of staff and commissions contribute to quality and balance in the development of information and judgments. In contrast to Los Angeles, where there is only one professional dedicated full-time to preservation work, full-time staff in other cities range from fifty in New York to fifteen in Chicago and six to ten in smaller cities such as Seattle or Pasadena.

Balance and Certainty in the Project Planning Process

The survey of other cities revealed the maturity of the preservation process and the community benefits it can provide. In all cities, preservation survey and planning work appeared to be highly integrated with planning and economic development agencies, as well as projects initiated by neighborhood groups and developers. Last minute identification of resources and the perception that a project could be ambushed by preservation interests appeared to be nonexistent in the cities with advanced survey programs. There is greater certainty within the development process. Many of the preservation agencies and their commissions are within or operate laterally with planning and economic development agencies. Others, such as that in New York, are independent agencies that coordinate extensively with related land use agencies. Los Angeles appeared to be the only program in which the identification of landmarks and historic districts is conducted by separate agencies and processes. All cities are working to incorporate their historic resource survey information technologically with other planning data.

Survey Pitfalls

The Survey Assessment Project highlighted the pitfalls of an ad hoc survey process and weak preservation program, which relies heavily on private consulting firms to conduct surveys and make evaluations without a reasonable overview or common evaluation standards and methods. The closest example to the Los Angeles practice is that observed in Dallas, which became dissatisfied with a comparable ad hoc process and commenced a citywide survey in 2000 in order to achieve the goals of comprehensiveness, balance, and certainty.

Los Angeles's Strengths

The comparative review revealed that Los Angeles has notable strengths and assets upon which to build a citywide survey. These include the previous survey and historic context statements upon which future survey work may be built. The Los Angeles Geographic Information System (GIS), which currently identifies all designated Historic-Cultural Landmarks and HPOZs as part of a larger parcel-by-parcel documentation system, is another strength. The GIS could be adapted to integrate historic resource survey information to allow efficient access for agency personnel and others. Finally, the strength of private preservation efforts and the momentum and success of HPOZs within a broad spectrum of neighborhoods represent important inspiration and reference points for the establishment of future historic districts.

Key Issues

The review of comparable city surveys revealed ten key survey components related to successful surveys and effective use of survey data:

1. Survey data gathering is the means to several ends, not an end in itself. Among the end uses are education, protection, investment, and reuse. All cities contacted have a range of programs and financial or tax incentives associated with surveys and designated properties.
2. The survey process emphasizes factual information and is inclusive of architectural, historical, and cultural factors. Numerical ratings of significance by consultants are diminishing in importance due to inherent subjectivity. New York, Pasadena, and Oakland assign significance only at the conclusion of staff review or at designation.
3. The survey process involves the community in order to build interest and support for preservation. Reconnaissance level surveys have minimal community involvement; more intensive surveys to establish historic districts expand community participation.
4. The historic resource survey is ongoing. Surveys provide the base information for further research, development, and interpretation of the data. Surveys conducted in Chicago, Seattle, and Pasadena build upon surveys begun in the 1980s. Thematic surveys or surveys tied to municipal initiatives (e.g., school construction, public works projects) typically involve stakeholder groups.
5. There is a correlation between the composition (including leadership, size, and expertise) and continuity of staff and review bodies and the realization of survey benefits. All of the communities contacted are Certified Local Governments.
6. Public and professional inputs in the evaluation, nomination, and designation process increase the validity of the determination of property significance.
7. Public use and dissemination of survey information is viewed as essential. Inclusion on Internet geographic information systems is a priority for all communities.
8. The strength of the local preservation ordinance and relationship to investment incentives enhances survey results.
9. The survey process must be positioned positively in the community in order to encourage participation and acceptance.
10. Participation by preservation agency staff in a network of local and national allied groups is an important element in remaining current with survey practices and priorities.

INCENTIVES TO PROPERTY OWNERS AND OTHERS IN THE REHABILITATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES AND REVITALIZATION OF HISTORIC AREAS

The growth of the preservation movement has paralleled the evolution of a more appreciative view of historical continuity and urban life. This shift in the cultural climate has in turn been reinforced by favorable public policy initiatives, tax incentives, and funding programs accompanied by successful development projects and positive market response.

The preservation movement has increasingly turned from a regulatory approach to a market-driven reality. Some of the most successful development projects in the country have occurred in the context of strong local support and incentives. Preservation incentives range from funding programs to tax breaks that help offset the risk and development costs associated with property conversion and rehabilitation. In most cases the incentives are accompanied by disincentives aimed at discouraging the destruction or substantial alteration of historic resources.

Los Angeles and California are just beginning to establish incentives for preservation work—a rapidly developing area of concern nationwide. The following incentives are currently offered in Los Angeles:

Financial Incentives

Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits amount to 10 percent or 20 percent on rehabilitation spending for old and historic buildings.

Conservation/Façade Easements offer an income tax deduction for the donation of a specific portion of a historic property to a qualified 501 C 3 charitable organization.

The Mills Act provides property tax relief to owners of residential and commercial historic properties in exchange for covenants to continue preservation of the property.

The Investment Tax Credit for Low-Income Housing provides tax credits for the acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of low-income housing and can be applied to historic properties. The housing tax credits may be used in combination with rehabilitation tax credits.

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development programs specifically include historic preservation as an eligible activity. Many communities have used the Community Development Block Grant program and other

HUD programs to develop incentive grant and loan programs to target revitalization work. Legislation and programs in redevelopment project areas also provide important resources for investment in historic properties.

The California Downtown Rebound Program provides financial assistance to fund the adaptive reuse of commercial office buildings to housing.

Pending legislation: The State of California is considering a 20 percent State Rehabilitation Credit that would piggy-back on the federal historic rehabilitation tax credits and would include an additional 5 percent credit for certified historic structures in redevelopment project areas.

A federal *Historic Homeownership Tax Credit* has been proposed, which would provide up to a 20 percent tax credit for renovation costs for historic residential properties in state or federally designated historic neighborhoods.

Construction Incentives

The City of Los Angeles Adaptive Reuse Provisions streamline the permit process and provide flexibility in meeting zoning and building code requirements for adaptive reuse projects that convert underutilized commercial buildings to more productive use such as live-work and residential use.

The California State Building Code provides flexibility in meeting code requirements in historic buildings.

Transfer of Development Rights may occur in the Downtown Redevelopment Project area. Unused development rights associated with a property can be sold and transferred to other sites within the project area up to a maximum floor area ratio of thirteen to one.

CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In order to assist local preservation efforts, the National Park Service in partnership with state governments established the Certified Local Governments (CLG) Program under the National Historic Preservation Act. Communities that qualify as CLGs are eligible for technical assistance from the State Historic Preservation Office and may each year receive small federal matching grants. The grants may be used for historic resource surveys, the development of preservation plans and design guidelines, heritage-tourism program planning, education programs and other preservation-related activities.

To qualify as a CLG, a municipality must meet five minimum guidelines established by the National Park Service. Local governments must:

1. Enforce appropriate state and local legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties;
2. Establish an adequate and qualified historic preservation review commission by local law;
3. Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties;
4. Provide for adequate public participation in the local historic preservation program, including the process of reviewing and recommending properties for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places; and
5. Satisfactorily perform the duties delegated to it by the state.

The Certified Local Governments Program is intended to foster partnerships among the federal, state, and local governments with the goal of education and consensus building. It does not function as a regulatory process but rather provides a framework for historic preservation planning.

Since the program was established in 1980, every major United States city has certified its local preservation program. Within California, over forty-five municipalities are CLGs. In July 2001 the Los Angeles City Council approved a motion requesting the Los Angeles City Attorney to revise the municipal preservation ordinances to comply with CLG requirements.

RELATIVE COSTS OF SURVEYS

The following data is useful in demonstrating the wide range of costs encountered in various surveys.

HPOZ Surveys

The Los Angeles Department of City Planning has a number of survey projects underway at this time. The cost proposed by consultants is based upon the number of developed parcels to be surveyed, the age distribution of buildings, and the availability of prior surveys. These costs do not include staff time expended in processing survey information. Examples of survey cost include:

<i>Location</i>	<i>Survey Cost</i>	<i>Number of Properties</i>
Hancock Park	\$73,000	1,200
Larchmont Heights	29,900	175
Windsor Square	63,900	1,100
Los Feliz	82,000	4,000

EIR Surveys

The Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency has recently commissioned an Environmental Impact Review for the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area, which will include an update of the 1980s historic resource survey for the project area. This survey will revise data for the 1800-acre project area at a cost of approximately \$53,000.

LAUSD

The Los Angeles Unified School District may need to complete historic resource surveys for 122 proposed school sites. Responses to a recently issued "Request for Proposals" indicate that the cost on a per property basis for intensive level surveys for the properties associated with each of the prospective sites would be \$500 per property. The potential cost range for the entire project is \$1,220,000–\$6,100,000.

Citywide, Volunteer-Based Surveys

Preservation Dallas is initiating a citywide reconnaissance survey using professional leadership and extensive volunteer assistance. The multiyear survey of 250,000 properties is projected to cost \$400,000.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION OVERLAY ZONES (HPOZs)

CURRENT HPOZs

No.	Name	Adoption Date	Approx. # Contributing Structures	Approx. # Non-Contributing Structures	Boundaries
1	Adams-Normandie	7-5-00	526	200	Vermont Avenue to the east, 10 Freeway to the north, Normandie Avenue to the west, and 29th Street to the south
2	Angelino Heights	9-29-83	250	50	East Kensington Road to the east and north, West Kensington Road to the west, and Bellevue and Boston Avenues to the south
3	Banning Park	5-9-01	68	11 7	Cary Avenue to the east, M Street to the north, Lakme Avenue to the west, and L Street to the south
4	Carthay Circle	7-24-98	383	53	Fairfax Avenue to the east, Wilshire Boulevard to the north, Schumacher Drive to the west, and Olympic Boulevard to the south
5	Harvard Heights	8-2-00	573	233	Normandie Avenue to the east, Pico Boulevard to the north, Western Avenue to the west, and 10 Freeway to the south
6	Highland Park	6-7-94	2,000	500	110 Freeway to the east, York Boulevard to the north, Glenalbyn to the west, and Avenue 35 to the south (irregular in shape)
7	La Fayette Square	7-26-00	204	22	Crenshaw Avenue to the east, Venice Boulevard to the north, La Fayette Road to the west, and Washington Boulevard to the south
8	Melrose Hill	3-3-88	44	2	North Hobart Boulevard to the east, area jogs up to the properties adjacent to Lemon Grove Avenue to the north, jogs back down to North Oxford Avenue to the west, and down to the parcels that have frontage on Marathon Street to the south (irregular in shape)
9	Miracle Mile North	5-17-90	547	51	La Brea Avenue to the east, Beverly Boulevard to the north, Gardner Street to the west, and 3rd Street to the south
10	South Carthay	5-9-84	359	331	Crescent Heights to the east, Olympic Boulevard to the north, La Cienega to the west, and Pico Boulevard to the south
11	Spaulding Square	5-21-93	145	15	Spaulding Avenue to the east, Sunset Boulevard to the north, North Orange Grove Avenue to the west, and Fountain Avenue to the south
12	University Park (a.k.a. West Adams)	3-22-00	436	183	Figuerroa Avenue to the east, 10 Freeway to the north, Vermont and Hoover Avenues to the west, and West Adams and West 24th Street to the south

CURRENT HPOZs (continued)

No.	Name	Adoption Date	Approx. # Contributing Structures	Approx. # Non-Contributing Structures	Boundaries
13	Vinegar Hill	4-5-01	26	17	Palos Verdes Street to the east, 9th Street to the north, Centre Street to the west, and 10th Street to the south
14	Western Heights	3-2-01	127	48	Western Avenue to the east, Washington Boulevard to the north, Arlington Avenue to the west, and the 10 Freeway to the south
15	Whitley Heights	5-9-92	166	25	Area jogs from Whitley Avenue to Cerritos Place to the east, Whitley Terrace to the north, Watson Terrace jogging down to Las Palmas Avenue to the west and down to the parcels that have frontage on Emmet Terrace to the south (irregular in shape)

PROPOSED HPOZs

No.	Name	Consultant Selection Date	Approx. # Structures in Proposed Area	Proposed Boundaries
1	Hancock Park	7-5-00	1,314	Rossmore Avenue to the east, Melrose Avenue to the north, Highland Avenue to the west, and 6th Street to the south
2	Larchmont Heights	7-5-00	188	Gower Street to the east, Melrose Avenue to the north, Arden Boulevard to the west, and Beverly Boulevard to the South
3	Lincoln Heights	2-15-01	3,000	Lincoln Park and Mission Road to the east, Avenue 33 and Altura Street to the north, Pasadena Avenue to the west, and North Main Street to the south
4	Los Feliz	2-14-01	4352	5 Freeway to the east, Griffith Park to the north, Canyon Drive to the west, and Franklin/St. George/Rowena/ Glendale to the south
5	Venice	2-20-01	52	Pacific Avenue to the east, Horizon Avenue to the north, Ocean Front Walk to the west, and 17th Avenue to the south
6	Pico-Union	2-20-01	1,092	Harbor Freeway to the east, Olympic Boulevard to the north, Hoover Avenue to the west, and the 10 Freeway to the south
7	Van Nuys	7-12-01	369	Not yet established
8	West Adams Terrace-Kinney Heights-Berkeley Square	2-7-01	505	Western Avenue to the east, 10 Freeway to the north, rear lot lines of the properties to the west side of 13th Avenue to the west, and Adams Boulevard to the south
9	Windsor Square	7-5-01	1,227	Van Ness Avenue to the east, Beverly Boulevard to the north, Arden Boulevard to the west, and Wilshire Boulevard to the south

INVENTORY OF PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED SURVEYS

No.	Name	Year	Lead Agency/Org.	Survey Area / Boundaries	Purpose
1	Adams Normandie 4321 Architectural / Historical Survey, Cultural Resource Documentation Report	1981	Community Redevelopment Agency	10 Fwy. to the north, 110 Fwy. to the east, Adams Blvd. to the south, Normandie Ave. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Adams Normandie 4321, an Agency revitalization area
2	Boyle Heights #1 (Mt. Pleasant), Architectural / Historical Survey	1980	Community Redevelopment Agency	10 Fwy. to the north, 5 Fwy. to the east, Whittier Blvd. to the south, Santa Ana Fwy. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Boyle Heights #1, an Agency revitalization area
3	Chinatown, Architectural / Historical Survey	1981	Community Redevelopment Agency	Stadium Way to the north, N. Main St. to the east, Sunset Blvd. to the south, Beaudry Ave. to the west (irregular in shape)	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Chinatown, an Agency revitalization area
4	El Pueblo de Los Angeles, Cultural Resource Documentation Report Historic Preservation Overlay Zone	1981	Cultural Heritage Board	Sunset Blvd. to the north, Alameda St. to the east, 5 Fwy. to the south, Hill St. to the west (irregular in shape)	To recognize historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic resources within the City of Los Angeles (an HPOZ)
5	Elderly Housing and Pep Boys Expansion Project, Architectural Survey	1979	Community Redevelopment Agency	Two distinct geographical units within the boundaries of Olympic Blvd. to the north, 10 Fwy. to the south and Hoover St. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for the Elderly Housing and Pep Boys expansion area, Agency revitalization areas
6	Greater East Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Survey, Completion Report	1979	Community Research Group (CRG), a subsidiary of The East Los Angeles Community Union (TELACU)	Survey areas included the unincorporated East Los Angeles, Highland Park, El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, and Boyle Heights	To be used as a tool for comprehensive and sensitive planning for the Greater East Los Angeles community
7	Highland Park and Mount Washington Historic Resources Survey	1981	Community Research Group (CRG), a subsidiary of The East Los Angeles Community Union (TELACU)	Survey areas include Highland Park and Mount Washington	To be used as a tool for comprehensive and sensitive planning for the Highland Park and Mount Washington communities
8	Historical and Cultural Survey of Los Angeles, Final Report for Year One	1981	Bureau of Engineering	Survey areas include Westlake, Venice, San Pedro, and Echo Park	To recognize and document the visual assets and cultural resources of the City of Los Angeles in 4 Neighborhood Strategy Areas

INVENTORY OF PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED SURVEYS (continued)

No.	Name	Year	Lead Agency/Org.	Survey Area / Boundaries	Purpose
9	Historical and Cultural Resources Survey of Los Angeles, Final Report for Year Two	1982	Bureau of Engineering	Survey areas include Sun Valley, Kendren Park, Boyle Heights, Florence Avalon, and West Adams	To recognize and document the visual assets and cultural resources of the City of Los Angeles in 5 of 17 Neighborhood Strategy Areas
10	Historical and Cultural Resources Survey of Los Angeles, Final Report for Year Three	1983	Bureau of Engineering	Survey areas include Vermont/Slauson	To recognize and document the visual assets and cultural resources of the City of Los Angeles in 4 Neighborhood Strategy Areas
11	Hollywood Historic and Cultural Resources Survey, Final Report	1980	Hollywood Revitalization Committee	Survey areas include Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood/Western residential area, Sunset Blvd., Highland Ave. to La Brea Ave., and NSA Residential area	To promote the growth, renewal, and enrichment of the Hollywood community by providing information, regarding historic resources in the community, to be used in the planning process
12	Lincoln Heights 1, Determination of Eligibility Report	1982	Community Redevelopment Agency	Survey area includes Lincoln Heights	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Lincoln Heights 1, an Agency revitalization area
13	Los Angeles Central Business District, Determination of Eligibility Report	1983	Community Redevelopment Agency	110 Fwy. to the north, 5 Fwy. and Alameda St. to the east, 10 Fwy. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for the Central Business District, an Agency revitalization area
14	Los Angeles People Mover Program, Initial Architectural Survey	1978	Rapid Transit District	Route from Union Station to Convention Center	Conducted in order to determine the environmental impact of the Los Angeles People Mover program and the possible intrusion or "threat" to any structure along the proposed route
15	North Hollywood, Architectural / Historical Survey	1980	Community Redevelopment Agency	Hatteras St. to the north, Cahuenga Blvd. to the east, Ventura Fwy. to the south, Burbank Blvd. to the west (irregular in shape)	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for North Hollywood, an Agency revitalization area
16	North University Park Survey Area, Historical and Cultural Survey Report	1983	Bureau of Engineering	Adams Blvd. to the north, Hoover St. to the east, 30th St. to the south, Vermont Ave. to the west	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance
17	Olympic / Normandie Survey Area Report Year Four, City of Los Angeles Historical and Cultural Resources Survey East Section	1984	Bureau of Engineering	San Marino St. to the north, Western Ave. to the east, Pico Blvd. to the south, Arlington Ave. to the west	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance

INVENTORY OF PREVIOUSLY CONDUCTED SURVEYS (continued)

No.	Name	Year	Lead Agency/Org.	Survey Area / Boundaries	Purpose
18	Olympic/Normandie Survey Area Report Year Four, City of Los Angeles Historical and Cultural Resources Survey South Section	1984	Bureau of Engineering	Adams Blvd. to the north, 10th Ave. to the east, 41st St. to the south, Farmdale Ave. to the west (irregular in shape)	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance
19	Olympic/Normandie Survey Area Report Year Four, City of Los Angeles Historical and Cultural Resources Survey West Section	1985	Bureau of Engineering	Olympic Blvd. to the north, Crenshaw Blvd. to the east, Pico Blvd. to the south, Rimpau Ave. to the west	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance
20	Pacoima Survey Area Report Year Four, City of Los Angeles Historical and Cultural Resources Survey	1984	Bureau of Engineering	210 Fwy. to the north, 210 Fwy. to the east, Van Nuys Blvd. to the south, 5 Fwy. to the west	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance
21	Pedway Project Area, Architectural Survey	1979	Community Redevelopment Agency	Wilshire Blvd. to the north, Olive St. to the east, 8th St. to the south, 110 Fwy. to the west	To comprehensively evaluate the impact of the Pedway project in relation to existing architectural resources
22	Pico Union I Redevelopment Project, Determination of Eligibility Report	1981	Community Redevelopment Agency	Union Ave. and Olympic Blvd. to the north, 110 Fwy. to the east, 10 Fwy to the south, 18th Street and Burlington Ave. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Pico Union I, an Agency revitalization area
23	Pico Union II Redevelopment Project, Determination of Eligibility Report	1981	Community Redevelopment Agency	Olympic Blvd. to the north, Union Ave. to the east, 10 Fwy. to the south, Hoover Ave. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for Pico Union II, an Agency revitalization area
24	Religious Buildings in the City of Los Angeles, Survey of Historically and Architecturally Significant	1987	Los Angeles Conservancy	Survey areas include Little Tokyo, Chinatown, Wilming-ton, Highland Park, Echo Park, Atwater, No. University Park, Silverlake, San Pedro, West-lake, Elysian Park, Eagle Rock, Wilshire Center, Koreatown, Cypress, and Glassell Park	To identify religious buildings of potential historic and architectural significance in varying styles and types serving a range of religious groups in geographically diverse areas of the City of Los Angeles
25	South Park Plaza Project Area, Architectural Survey	1979	Community Redevelopment Agency	9th St. to the north, Hope St. to the east, Olympic Blvd. to the south, Flower St. to the west	Survey was prepared at the request of the Community Redevelopment Agency for the South Park Plaza Project Area, an Agency revitalization area
26	Vernon/Central Survey Area Report Year Four, City of Los Angeles Historical and Cultural Resources Survey	1984	Bureau of Engineering	Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. to the north, Compton Ave. to the east, Slauson Ave. to the south, Avalon Blvd. to the west	To identify and document historic resources with potential architectural and cultural significance

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Planning Association. *Preparing a Historic Preservation Plan*. Bradford J. White and Richard J. Roddewig. 1994.
- The Brookings Institution Center on Urban Metropolitan Policy. *Ten Steps to a Living Downtown*. Jennifer Moulton, FAIA. 1999.
- California Office of Historic Preservation. *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Historic Resources*. N.d.
- California Office of Historic Preservation. *California State Law and Historic Preservation: Statutes, Regulations and Administrative Policies Regarding Historic Preservation and Protection of Cultural and Historical Resources*. N.d.
- City of Los Angeles Planning Department System and GIS Section. *Historical Monument Community Report*. 2000.
- City of Pasadena Planning Division, Urban Conservation Section. *City of Pasadena City-Wide Historic Resources Survey, Final Report*. Triem et al. 1993.
- Commission on Chicago Landmarks and Chicago Department of Planning and Development. *Chicago Historic Resources Survey: An Inventory of Architecturally and Historically Significant Structures*. 1996.
- Cultural Heritage Commission. *Historic Cultural Monuments*. 1994.
- Galvin, William Francis. *Preservation Planning Manual, Local Historical Commissions: Their Role in Local Government*. 1992.
- Hudnut, William H., III. "A Catalyst for Redevelopment." *Urban Land*. 1999.
- David Listokin et al. "Economic Impacts of Preservation in New Jersey and Texas." *Forum Journal*. 2000.
- Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department. *Cultural Heritage Master Plan*. Historic Resources Group et al. 2000.
- National Park Service and National Trust for Historic Preservation. *Affordable Housing through Historic Preservation*. William Delvac et al.
- National Register of Historic Places, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. Anne Derry et al., revised by Patricia L. Parker. 1985.
- Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation Resources Agency. *Forging a Future with a Past: Comprehensive Statewide Historic Preservation Plan for California*. 1997.
- Office of Historic Preservation, Department of Parks and Recreation Resources Agency. *Instructions for Recording Historical Resources*. 1985.
- NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission. *NOHO Historic District Designation Report*. Donald G. Presa. 1999.
- City of Oakland Historic Preservation Task Force. *City of Oakland Historic Preservation: An Element of the Oakland General Plan*. 1998.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Preservation Assistance Division. *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. 1990.
- Welch Howe, Kathryn. "Private Sector Involvement in Historic Preservation: A Richer Heritage." (Forthcoming, University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

Web Sites

California Office of Historic Preservation
<http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/>

City of Los Angeles, City Planning Department
<http://www.lacity.org/PLN>

Cultural Affairs Department, Cultural Heritage Department
<http://culturela.org/heritage/landmarks.htm>

Los Angeles Conservancy
<http://www.laconservancy.org/>

National Register of Historic Places
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/>

National Trust for Historic Preservation
<http://www.nthp.org/>

Texas Historical Commission, Texas Historic Sites Atlas
<http://atlas.thc.state.tx.us/>

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED FOR THE LOS ANGELES HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY ASSESSMENT PROJECT

Daniel Abeyta
Special Assistant to the Director, California Department of Parks
and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Katherine Adams
Office of Regional Services, National Trust for Historic
Preservation, Washington, D.C.

Eric Allison
Information Technology Specialist II, California Department
of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation,
Sacramento

James Anderson
Associate Planner, Dallas Department of City Planning

Phillip Bacerra
City Planning Assistant, Los Angeles Department of City
Planning, Community Planning Bureau

Ken Bernstein
Director of Preservation Issues, Los Angeles Conservancy

Mary Beth Betts
Director of Research, New York City Landmarks Preservation
Commission

Kenneth A. Breisch, Ph.D.
Director, Historic Preservation Program, University of
Southern California, School of Architecture, Los Angeles

Robert Burke
Attorney, Rose & Kindel, Los Angeles

Murray Burns
Chair, HPOZ Coordinating Council, Angelino Heights HPOZ,
Los Angeles

John J. Butcher
GIS Supervisor II, City of Los Angeles, Department of City
Planning, System and GIS Division

James Canales
Program Officer, Irvine Foundation, San Francisco

Rita Cox
Chair, Board of Directors, Preservation Dallas

Courtney Damkroger
Planner, San Jose Landmarks Commission

Roberta Deering
Executive Director, California Preservation Foundation,
Oakland

William Delvac
Partner, Latham and Watkins, Los Angeles

Sylvia Deutsch
Former Chair, New York City Planning Commission

Matthew Dillhoefer
Historical Property Contracts Manager, City of Los Angeles,
Cultural Affairs Department

Linda Dishman
Executive Director, Los Angeles Conservancy

John English
Preservation Consultant, Los Angeles

Rand Eppich
Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles

Philip Ethington
Executive Director, Information System for Los Angeles,
University of Southern California

Holly Fiala
Regional Director, Western Regional Office, National Trust
for Historic Preservation, San Francisco

Myra L. Frank
Principal, Myra L. Frank and Associates, Inc., Los Angeles

David Gay
Principal City Planner, Los Angeles Department of City
Planning

Frank B. Gilbert
Senior Field Representative, National Trust for Historic
Preservation, Washington, D.C.

Bryan Goeken
Acting Director/Assist. Commissioner, City of Chicago,
Department of Planning & Development, Landmarks Division

Karen Gordon
Supervisor & Historic Preservation Officer, Seattle
Department of Neighborhoods

Maureen Gorsen
Of Counsel, Weston Benshoof Rochefort Rubalcava
MacCuish LLP

Christopher Gray
Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles

Peyton Hall
Principal, Historic Resources Group, Los Angeles

Leslie Heumann
Principal, Architectural Historian, Sr. Project Manager,
Science Application International Corporation, Los Angeles

Thomas S. Hines
Professor, University of California Los Angeles, Department
of Architecture and Urban Design

Catherine Horsey
Executive Director, Providence Preservation Society
Dallas, Texas

Con Howe
Director, Los Angeles Department of City Planning

Eugene M. Itogawa
Supervisor, Fiscal and Information Management Unit,
California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of
Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Donna Jerex
Associate Planner, Santa Monica Planning Department, Santa
Monica Landmarks Commission

Christy Johnson McAvoy
Principal, Historic Resources Group, Los Angeles

Kevin D. Jones
City Planning Associate, Los Angeles Department of City
Planning

Mindy Jones
Program Officer, Ahmanson Foundation, Los Angeles

Maureen Kavanaugh
Director of Geographic Information System, Maryland
Historic Trust, Annapolis

Kevin J. Keller
City Planning Assistant, Los Angeles Department of City
Planning

Jeanne Lambin
Assistant Director, Midwest Regional Office, National Trust
for Historic Preservation, Chicago

Ruthann Lehrer
Neighborhood Planner & Historic Preservation Officer,
City of Long Beach

Brenda Levin, FAIA
Levin & Associates, Los Angeles

Betty Marvin
Historic Preservation Planner, Oakland Cultural Heritage
Surveys Strategic Planning, City of Oakland Community
and Economic Development Agency

Joseph McDole
Data Manager, California Department of Parks and
Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Knox Mellon
State Historic Preservation Officer, California Department
of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation,
Sacramento

Doug Mende
Vice President/Secretary, Information Systems Management
Solutions, Inc., Redlands

Gayle F. Miller
Architectural Historian, Myra L. Frank and Associates, Inc.,
Los Angeles

Cindy Miscikowski
Council Member, City of Los Angeles

Barry Munitz
President, The J. Paul Getty Trust, Los Angeles

Michael Olecki
Attorney, South Carthay HPOZ, Los Angeles

Jay Oren
Architect, Historic Preservation Officer, City of Los Angeles
Department of Cultural Affairs

Mark Pisano
President, Southern California Association of Governments,
Los Angeles

Josephine Ramirez
Getty Grant Program, Los Angeles

Wayne Ratkovich
President, The Ratkovich Co., Los Angeles

Luis Rodriguez, Jr.
City Planning Associate, Los Angeles Department of City
Planning

Steve Rountree
Chief Operating Officer, The J. Paul Getty Trust, Los Angeles

Jack Rubens
Attorney, Shephard Mullin Richter and Hampton, Los Angeles

Michael Russell
President, Urban Dimensions, Inc., Los Angeles

Trudi Sandmeier
Preservation Advocate, Los Angeles Conservancy

Chris Seki
Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles

Carol Shull
Keeper, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Judy Spiegel
Director of Programs, California Community Foundation, Los Angeles

Richard Starzak
Senior Architectural Historian/Project Manager, Myra L. Frank and Associates, Inc., Los Angeles

Robert Stipe
Professor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Robert H. Sutton
Deputy Director, City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning

John R. Thomas
State Historian II, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Robert H. Timme, FAIA
Della & Harry MacDonald Dean, University of Southern California, School of Architecture, Los Angeles

Joel Wachs
Council Member, City of Los Angeles

Richard Weinstein, FAIA
Professor of Architecture, University of California Los Angeles

Tim Whalen
Director, Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles

Cherilyn Widell
Compliance Officer, Presidio Trust, San Francisco

Patty Wilson
Arts Deputy, Office of Council Member Joel Wachs, City of Los Angeles

Mary Jo Winder
Senior Planner, Design & Historic Preservation, Pasadena Planning & Permitting Department

Rhonda Wist
Executive Director New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission

Lucinda Woodward
State Historian III, Supervisor Local Government Unit, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Jan Wooley
State Historian II, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation, Sacramento

Dwayne Wyatt
City Planning Associate, Los Angeles Department of City Planning

Ira E. Yellin
Principal, Urban Partners, LLC, Los Angeles

Eva Yuan-McDaniel
Director of Systems, City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning